

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
22 APRIL 2004

These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:00 P.M. to 9:20 P.M., Thursday, 22 April 2004 at Dago Mary's Restaurant (Building #916 at the Shipyard). A verbatim transcript was also prepared for the meeting and is available in the Information Repository for Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) and on the Internet at www.efds.w.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm. The list of agenda topics is provided below. Attachment A provides a list of attendees. Attachment B includes action items that were requested and/or committed to by RAB members during the meeting.

AGENDA TOPICS:

- 1) Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review
- 2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from 25 March 2004 RAB Meeting
- 3) Subcommittee Reports
- 4) Parcel A ROD and Related Documents
- 5) City of San Francisco/Navy Conveyance Agreement
- 6) Future Agenda Topics/Open Question & Answer
- 7) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for 22 April 2004 RAB
- Meeting/Minutes from 25 March 2004 RAB Meeting
 - Includes: Action Items from 25 March 2004 RAB Meeting; and
 - Table 1, RAB Roll-Call Sheet
- PowerPoint Presentation, Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai, Parcel A ROD and Related Documents, 22 April 2004
- Written Presentation Notes, Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai, Parcel A ROD, 22 April 2004
- Meeting Minutes, HPS RAB, Economic Subcommittee, 06 April 2004
- Letter from ARC Ecology to Jay Navarrette, Comments on the Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review, 19 September 2003
- Petition from HPS RAB to SFRA, Request for Continuance of "Conveyance Agreement" Pending Environmental Review
- Flyer, SFRA, Special Meeting, HPS Conveyance Agreement, 29 April 2004

Welcome / Introductions / Agenda and Meeting Minutes Review

Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. All in attendance made self-introductions. Ms. Pendergrass began the meeting and asked if there were any changes to the agenda; of which there were none. Ms. Pendergrass called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes and the minutes were approved with no revisions.

Ms. Pendergrass reviewed the Action Items contained in the March minutes and asked for a status of each item. Three of the items were carried-over (see Attachment B) and the remainder of the action items were resolved to the satisfaction of the RAB.

Navy and Community Co-Chair Reports/Other Announcements

Lynne Brown, RAB Community Co-Chair, asked about a recent Technical Review Subcommittee meeting that included meeting with the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC). He said the RAB had not voted to approve such a meeting. Lea Loizos, RAB member, replied that she copied Mr. Brown on a letter to Don Capobres, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA), requesting a joint meeting between the Technical Review Subcommittee and the CAC. There was a lot of discussion about the appropriateness of a subcommittee of the RAB meeting with the Redevelopment and the CAC. Mr. Brown made a motion that any subcommittee of the RAB intending to hold a meeting with the CAC or any outside agency must first get the approval of the full RAB. The motion carried. There was additional discussion about the motion and its implication for each subcommittee. This additional discussion produced confusion amongst some of the RAB members. Ms. Pendergrass ended the discussion and requested that Mr. Brown restate and submit the motion in writing at the next RAB meeting where the motion will be ratified.

Keith Forman, Navy RAB Co-Chair, announced that the Community Involvement Plan (CIP) has been finalized and released. He thanked Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech, for her work on the CIP. Mr. Forman also said that there was a fire yesterday at an artist's studio located next to Lola's Café. He also announced that the comment period for the Parcel A Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) has been extended to Monday, 17 May 2004. He said that he will go into greater detail in further e-mails and a presentation when he knows more, but briefly Building 322, a former guard shack on Parcel A, is also listed as having once been located on Parcel D. Mr. Forman said a complete radiological survey will be completed before moving forward with the FOST. Ray Tompkins, RAB member, asked if the survey would include lead-based paint or asbestos. Mr. Forman replied that the survey would not look for those materials. Procedures for addressing lead-based paint and asbestos are already detailed in the FOST.

Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 to 8:00 P.M., Thursday evening, 27 May 2004 at Dago Mary's Restaurant, Building #916 on the Shipyard.

Subcommittee Updates

Membership, Bylaws & Community Outreach Subcommittee (Melita Rines, leader)

Melita Rines, RAB member, said the subcommittee did not meet this month.

Ms. Rines said that Marie Harrison is hereby removed the RAB due to excessive absences. A letter will be mailed informing Ms. Harrison of the determination. She said that Ms. Harrison will be encouraged to re-apply to the RAB.

Ms. Rines also said Community Co-Chair elections will be coming up in June. Nominations for the position will be made at the May RAB meeting, elections will be held at the June meeting, and the term for the Community Co-Chair position will run from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005.

On the agenda for the next subcommittee meeting will be discussing the SFPD term sheet, and clarifying the language of the Bylaws regarding attendance. She reminded the RAB that changes to the Bylaws will not be made until the September RAB meeting. Barbara Bushnell, RAB member, said that the definition of calendar year is already clear, but Ms. Rines said the long-standing interpretation of Bylaws subcommittee has a calendar year being 12 months back from the month of the current RAB meeting. The differences will be resolved in the next changes to the Bylaws. Ms. Rines stressed that this interpretation has been consistently and fairly applied to each former RAB member who was removed due to excessive absences.

1 The next meeting of the Membership, Bylaws & Community Outreach Subcommittee will be
2 6:30 P.M., May 12th, at the Anna Waden Branch Library.

3 Risk Review and Health Assessment Subcommittee (Karen Pierce, Leader)

4 Karen Pierce, RAB member, said the subcommittee did not meet this month.

5 Ms. Pierce said the next meeting of the subcommittee will be determined at a later date.

6 Technical Review Subcommittee (Lea Loizos, Leader)

7 Ms. Loizos reported on two meetings. The Tech subcommittee met and discussed the Parcel A
8 FOST and there was a joint meeting with the Risk Review subcommittee that had been
9 scheduled but cancelled. Ms. Loizos said though the joint meeting was cancelled she did prepare
10 for the meeting and had a few items to report.

11 Starting with the Tech subcommittee meeting to discuss the Parcel A FOST, Ms. Loizos
12 apologized that meeting minutes were unavailable. She summarized the meeting and said several
13 regulators, RAB members, and the Navy were present and the meeting was an opportunity to
14 express concerns and ask questions. Ms. Loizos said the majority of the concerns were regarding
15 adjacency issues, and there was little discussion of Parcel A itself.

16 Ms. Loizos also reported that she looked into the Parcel A risk assessment and the Parcel E
17 radiological risk assessment, at the request of Ahimsa Sumchai, RAB member. She replied that
18 some of the preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) from the EPA were revised and have become
19 less stringent for manganese and nickel. Ms. Loizos also said that concerns of metals in the
20 groundwater were more or less resolved since the regulatory agencies have determined the
21 groundwater underneath the Shipyard to be non-beneficial and therefore unlikely to pose a health
22 threat. Regarding a review of the Parcel E radiological risk assessment, Ms. Loizos said the
23 comments were that there was not enough consideration of how materials might have gotten off
24 the Shipyard, as well as the effects off-site migration might have had on the bay and the
25 sediments in the bay. The review also questioned why radium was the only radionuclide of
26 concern on Parcel E.

27 Mr. Tompkins objected to the Navy changing the PRGs for manganese and nickel, as well as the
28 subcommittee's report that these new levels are safe. He asserted that African-Americans are
29 more susceptible to certain environmental contaminants than a 35-year old white male – the
30 standard for standard risk assessment calculations. Ms. Loizos clarified her report and stated that
31 the Navy did not change the PRGs, the EPA is the regulatory agency that sets the cleanup goals.
32 Michael Work, US EPA, said he was unsure what variables were use for the PRGs for
33 manganese but he would look into the question and report back.

34 J.R. Manual, RAB member, made a motion that Mr. Work should respond to the question about
35 why the standards were changed. The motion carried. Ms. Pendergrass suggested that Mr. Work
36 give the report to the Risk Review and Health Assessment Subcommittee before reporting back
37 to the full RAB.

38 Ms. Loizos said that the Technical Review Subcommittee will meet at 5:30 P.M., May 6th, at the
39 Community Window on the Shipyard, 4634 Third Street.

40 Break called at 7:12 P.M. Ms. Pendergrass called the meeting back to order at 7:22 P.M.

41 Economic Development Subcommittee (Maurice Campbell, Leader)

42 Maurice Campbell, RAB member, yielded the floor to Mark Gelsinger, Navy, for the
43 subcommittee report. Mr. Gelsinger said an economic development workshop was held at the
44 E.P. Mills Auditorium on March 27th which was attended by 122 participants from the

community and 57 vendors. Presentations were made with the goal of discussing subcontracting opportunities.

Mr. Gelsinger said that earlier today, a training session workshop was held for local Bayview truckers. He said the goal is to try and standardize the requirements for the invoicing and proposal process. Mr. Gelsinger also said that the subcommittee will provide 8-hour HAZWOPER training twice next month.

Mr. Gelsinger concluded his report with some economic figures. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2003, the Navy spent \$38 million on the Shipyard and \$700k locally. Since starting FY'04, the Navy has spent \$28 million on the Shipyard, with \$2.5 million locally on trucking and an additional \$144k to local businesses. Mr. Gelsinger also said compared to 39 local hires in FY'03, thus far 28 local hires have been made with an additional 69 expected through the remainder of the year.

Mr. Campbell said the next meeting of the subcommittee will be at 2:30 P.M., May 4th, at the Anna Waden Library.

Ad-Hoc Radiological Subcommittee (Ahimsa Sumchai, Leader)

There was no report from the subcommittee.

The Radiological Subcommittee will meet at 3:00 P.M. on May 26th, at the Greenhouse, located at 4919 Third Street, at Palou.

Parcel A ROD and Related Documents

Dr. Sumchai introduced herself and said the topic of her presentation is the Parcel A Record of Decision (ROD) and supporting documents, as well as focusing on some of the health and legal aspects of the proposed transfer of Parcel A. There were no handouts available for the presentation.

Dr. Sumchai began with a historical summary of Parcel A. She said the Parcel was established in 1992 as part of the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) between the Navy and the regulators as was agreed upon after the closure of the Shipyard. Also, following environmental investigations by the Navy the Shipyard was placed on the National Priorities List (NPL) due to the presence of hazardous substances present throughout the Shipyard. Dr. Sumchai said Parcel A is very interesting in that it has undergone numerous revisions of its boundaries, originally 90 acres and now 75 acres, in an effort to remove contaminants from within the boundaries. She stated that the more you study Parcel A, and find more contamination, the smaller the Parcel becomes. Dr. Sumchai said revisions of the Parcel A boundaries triggers CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act) and NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) review, whereby any revision of the boundaries of a parcel that has been previously cleared by CERCLA must consider adjacency issues that are introduced by the revisions.

Dr. Sumchai said 7 of the 15 subparcels in Parcel A have an environmental condition of property (ECP) overall category of 4 to 7. She discussed how in one instance the Navy averaged the results from two adjacent subparcels (S46A in Parcel A and S46E in Parcel E) to arrive at an overall ECP value low enough to allow transfer. She also said that there are areas of the Shipyard that never underwent the CERCLA process of the first steps of preliminary assessment and site investigation. And yet the Navy assigned ECP categorizations for areas that essentially were never looked at. She also added that none of the five geographic land parcels on the Shipyard have gone through the full nine steps of the CERCLA process.

Dr. Sumchai returned to her examination of Parcel A, and specifically the dirt at Parcel A and the levels of ambient chemicals of potential concern that are present there. She said that Ms. Loizos'

1 interpretation of the human health risk assessment report for Parcel A is wrong. She said the risk
2 assessment minimized its impact not because the PRGs were lowered but because some of the
3 chemicals of potential concern (arsenic, lead, cobalt, chromium, and nickel) that initially drove
4 the high cancer risk and adverse health effects were removed after being designated as having a
5 Hunters Point Ambient Level (HPAL). Dr. Sumchai said an great deal of uncertainty and
6 controversy went into calculating the HPALs. For example, nickel is abundant in the earth's
7 crust however according to the medical establishment, the highest sources of nickel in the
8 environment comes from the combustion of fuel oil. Dr. Sumchai suggested that the nickel at the
9 Shipyard might be ambient or it might be the result of the 610,000 gallons of fuel oil that was
10 burned in Operation Crossroads. This and other examples she presented raises the question of
11 whether or not levels of chemical contaminants present at the Shipyard, particularly those present
12 at levels above the HPALs, are truly ambient.

13 Dr. Sumchai concluded her presentation by stating that Parcel A is not suitable for transfer. She
14 cited seven subparcels within Parcel A that have a ECP classification of 4 to 7. Also, she said the
15 Navy has failed to conduct radiological investigation of the storm drain and sanitary sewer
16 systems on Parcel A even though the Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA) established that
17 basewide, the storm drains are considered an impacted area. Dr. Sumchai also said that black
18 beauty sandblast grit was discovered in two sites at IR-59 JAI. She said radiological analyses
19 were not done on either of those sites. She asserted that IR-59 JAI is essentially a MARSSIM-
20 Class 1 (Multi-agency Radiological Survey and Site Investigation Manual) radiologically
21 impacted area. Dr. Sumchai also suggested that regulators should consider the documented
22 history of numerous fires that have occurred on Parcel A, and that it should be considered as an
23 imminent risk and threat to human lives and property.

24 Ms. Pendergrass opened the floor for questions from the RAB. Mr. Tompkins made a motion to
25 extend the RAB meeting to allow more time for questions and answers. The motion was
26 approved by the RAB.

27 Mr. Manual thanked Dr. Sumchai for her presentation. He asked the regulators present at the
28 meeting whether or not the CERCLA process was being circumvented, as suggested in the
29 presentation, and whether or not a full assessment will be conducted for Parcel A. Mr. Work
30 replied that the EPA is currently reviewing the Parcel A remedial decision but has not identified
31 anything that would cause them to reopen a CERCLA decision for Parcel A. Mr. Forman added
32 that there are two reports that make up the assessment for Parcel A – the ROD and the FOST.
33 The FOST documents the CERCLA and some non-CERCLA issues which make up the
34 comprehensive review that is required prior to transfer.

35 In the way of action items or recommendations, Dr. Sumchai requested that the EPA look into
36 the issues she raised in the conclusion of her presentation. Mr. Forman replied that the Navy
37 would look into the issues and report back to the RAB. Mr. Forman indicated that he felt
38 Dr. Sumchai was confused on some facets of environmental assessments. Mr. Tompkins
39 objected to Mr. Forman's remark. Lani Asher, RAB member, agreed with Mr. Tompkins.

40 Ms. Pierce said that the transfer of Parcel A should not proceed until the issue of ambient levels
41 of contamination is resolved. Mr. Forman said he could give a presentation on the development
42 and formulation of HPALs. Ms. Pierce replied that a presentation is unsatisfactory. She said that
43 discussions should resume since the RAB and the regulators agree that the calculation of the
44 ambient levels is in disagreement with the Navy's definitions. She made a motion that no transfer
45 take place until the definitions are clarified and an agreement is reached. The motion was
46 seconded and carried.

47 A second break called at 8:08 P.M. Ms. Pendergrass called the meeting back to order at 8:18 P.M.

1 Keith Tisdell, RAB member, made a motion that the Navy, regulators, and the RAB have a
2 special meeting to discuss these issues. He stipulated that the questions should be prepared and
3 distributed to everybody ahead of time. Lengthy discussion ensued about the date, time, and
4 format of such a meeting, and it was decided by show of hands that the meeting should take
5 place at 10:00 A.M., on Saturday, May 1st, at the Milton Meyers Gym. Ms. Pendergrass said that
6 questions should be directed to the Community Co-Chair, Mr. Brown.

7 **City of San Francisco/Navy Conveyance Agreement**

8 Elaine Warren, City of San Francisco, introduced herself and thanked the RAB for staying late to
9 hear her presentation. She began by saying the City is very pleased to have reached the point that
10 is has with the conveyance agreement, and thanked some members of the RAB for their
11 involvement.

12 Ms. Warren said she wanted to begin by dispelling some confusion surrounding the conveyance
13 agreement and reassured the RAB that it does not transfer property nor is the City bound to
14 accept property from the Navy if it is still dirty. She said that it spells-out a process for the
15 transfers of property in accordance with the rules in the conveyance agreement. She said her
16 presentation will explain the process of how the conveyance agreement was made with the Navy.
17 Also contained in the conveyance agreement are the principles of Proposition P.

18 Ms. Warren said the work on the conveyance agreement essentially started in 1991 when
19 Congresswoman Pelosi sponsored special legislation that allowed the Navy to transfer the
20 property to the City at no cost. Ms. Warren said the no-cost feature is an important component of
21 the conveyance agreement. She said there were a series of non-binding agreements that were
22 worked out with various San Francisco mayors and the Navy. In 1997 the Board of Supervisors
23 adopted the redevelopment plan, and at that time it was realized that there was a need to
24 incorporate the redevelopment plan into the transfer agreement with the Navy. That lead to a
25 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Navy in 2000 which, Ms. Warren said, was
26 instrumental in setting the framework for the conveyance agreement. Ms. Warren said one of the
27 key principles of the conveyance agreement is that it establishes environmental conditions for the
28 transfer of the property. It does not replace the CERCLA process but it established that there are
29 certain conditions the Navy needs to meet in order for the City to accept the property.

30 The conveyance agreement negotiations began in January 2002 and continued through March
31 2004. During that time, it was thoroughly reviewed by numerous people on the RAB, was
32 approved by the CAC, and also went to lawmakers in Washington D.C. for their approval.

33 Ms. Warren explained some of the details of the conveyance agreement, again stressing that it
34 does not transfer any property. She said it provides for the Navy to offer the property to the
35 Redevelopment Agency as each parcel is cleaned up to a level acceptable to the City. The Navy
36 will offer a parcel only after the regulators (US EPA, Department of Toxic Substances Control
37 [DTSC], and the Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB]) have agreed that the cleanup
38 is consistent with the redevelopment plan. The conveyance agreement also creates a partnership
39 for achieving property transfer by expressly recognizing the importance of the RAB. In the
40 agreement, the Navy pledges to continue to support the RAB and continue its functions and
41 operations. Ms. Warren said the agreement also provides that the City can inspect the property
42 and conduct its own due diligence to check on the conditions of the property before accepting
43 transfer. These agreements provide a closer working relationship between the City and the Navy
44 to try and move the cleanup process forward.

45 Ms. Warren also explained that the property conditions are different for different parcels. For
46 example, on Parcel A the cleanup standard the Navy needs to achieve is defined as unrestricted

1 residential reuse, as envisioned in the Parcel A ROD. For Parcel B, the City will hold the Navy
2 to the standard contained in the Parcel B ROD, which is cleanup to a level of 1×10^{-6} excess
3 cancer risk, even though regulators could relax that standard. She said that the City recognizes
4 that the Navy has experienced difficulties in trying to carry out the Parcel B ROD, and will work
5 with the Navy to try and resolve those problems. Ms. Warren said a ROD Amendment that is
6 open to public input is preferable to trying to work around the edges of the Parcel B ROD.

7 In whole, the conveyance agreement is seen by the City as a very positive document. To
8 discourage the Navy from intentionally slowing the cleanup process, the conveyance agreement
9 sets deadlines for cleanup as well as establishing incentives. The conveyance agreement does not
10 require the City to accept property that is not cleaned up nor is the conveyance agreement an
11 "early transfer". The Navy remains responsible for the property even after transfer to the City,
12 which is consistent with CERCLA law.

13 Ms. Warren concluded her presentation by quickly outlining the conveyance process. Once the
14 Navy offers a parcel to the City, the redevelopment agency has either 60 days (in the case of
15 Parcel A) or 30 days (for the other parcels) to determine whether the Navy has met the
16 requirements contained in the conveyance agreement. Assuming they've met the requirements,
17 the agency will notify the Navy of the concurrence and the process concludes 120 days after the
18 initial notice.

19 Ms. Pendergrass opened the floor for questions. Mr. Manual asked if the Navy has agreed to
20 adhere to Proposition P. Mr. Forman replied that the Navy has not agreed to that, however the
21 conveyance agreement incorporates the principles of Proposition P. Ms. Warren clarified that
22 when the Board of Supervisors endorsed Proposition P, they said it called for the highest
23 standards of cleanup that was practical to achieve. The conveyance agreement incorporates that
24 concept by establishing cleanup standards that will allow the redevelopment plan to be
25 implemented.

26 Kevyn Lutton, RAB member, asked for clarification on why the Mayor was called to
27 Washington D.C. Ms. Warren replied that new Navy management, who had not been involved
28 with the original negotiations, expressed some concerns about the conveyance agreement and
29 asked for a meeting to discuss their reservations.

30 A third break called at 8:58 P.M. Ms. Pendergrass called the meeting back to order at 9:04 P.M.

31 Georgia Oliva, RAB member, asked for clarification on a comment Mr. Forman made earlier in
32 the evening in reference to potential lead-based paint and asbestos cleanup at Building 322 being
33 the responsibility of the developer while in contrast Ms. Warren said the Navy is ultimately
34 responsible for cleaning up the property prior to transfer, per the conveyance agreement. Pat
35 Brooks, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM), replied that lead-based paint and asbestos
36 remediation will be the responsibility of the new developer when it is demolished. Any
37 radiological contamination, if found, will be cleaned up by the Navy. Ms. Warren added that
38 they are in agreement with the Navy since lead-based paint and asbestos are not covered under
39 CERCLA.

40 Mr. Tompkins asked if adjacent properties will be considered in the event of a property transfer.
41 Ms. Warren replied that the conveyance agreement include assurances that the parcel is safe for
42 the intended use and also requires looking at whether there are any possibilities of contamination
43 from adjacent uses. Mr. Tompkins asked for further clarification, while Mr. Brown made a
44 motion that the RAB approve a resolution calling for a full environmental review of the entire
45 Shipyard as RAB's response to the conveyance agreement. Ms. Pendergrass called the motion
46 and the motion carried.

1 Francisco Da Costa, attendee, asked Ms. Warren to address the rights of the Muwekma Ohlone
2 and conduct an archaeological survey of the Shipyard.

3 Mr. Campbell asked Ms. Warren to comment on Parcels C and D. She said one of the important
4 provisions of the conveyance agreement related to Parcels C and D is the requirement that the
5 Navy use its best good-faith efforts to reach cleanup standards. She said the Navy was concerned
6 that the required cleanup standards would be too difficult to reach, while the City was concerned
7 that the Navy would not try hard enough. The conveyance agreement defines the good-faith
8 effort to be spending up to \$120 million on Parcels C and D from the time that they enter into the
9 agreement. Dr. Sumchai asked if that means the Navy can transfer dirty property after spending
10 the required \$120 million trying to clean it up. Ms. Warren replied that the City is not obligated
11 to accept the property at that time. In the event the Navy cannot reach the cleanup standards, the
12 conveyance agreement allows for the City and the Navy to renegotiate the transfer.

13 Ms. Pendergrass closed the question and answer period.

14 **Future Agenda Topics**

15 Aside from the standard agenda topics and subcommittee updates, the following topic was
16 proposed for the May RAB meeting:

- 17 • Nominations for RAB Community Co-Chair

18 **Other Discussions/Topics**

19 The following items were also discussed at the RAB meeting. A verbatim account of these
20 discussions is included in the Information Repository for HPS and may also be found on the HPS
21 web page at www.efdsdsw.navfac.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm

- 22 • Ms. Bushnell raised a question with regard to dismissal of non-participating RAB
23 member who have been removed from the RAB due to absences. She said the HPS
24 Bylaws specify four absences in a calendar year and she feels the MB&CO
25 Subcommittee erred in prematurely removing four RAB members. Ms. Rines replied that
26 the issue was raised in a previous RAB meeting and will be discussed in depth at the next
27 MB&CO Subcommittee meeting. In the meantime, the rule will continue to be applied
28 until such time as the Bylaws are revised or additional language is added.
- 29 • Sam Ripley, RAB member, asked that Dr. Sumchai's presentation be made available in
30 other languages.
- 31 • Mr. Capobres announced that the redevelopment commission will hold a special meeting
32 at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 29th, at the Bayview Opera House to discuss
33 authorization of the conveyance agreement.

34 There were no further announcements. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

35 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 to 8:00 P.M., Thursday evening,**
36 **27 May 2004 at Dago Mary's Restaurant, Building #916 on the Shipyard.**

ATTACHMENT A

**22 APRIL 2004 - RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Name	Association
1. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
2. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
3. Keith Forman	Navy, RAB Co-chair
4. Pat Brooks	Navy, Lead Remedial Project Manager
5. Ryan Ahlersmeyer	Navy, Remedial Project Manager
6. Glenn Christensen	Navy
7. Mark Gelsinger	Navy
8. Matthew Lenz	Navy, ROICC Office
9. Ralph Pierce	Navy
10. Lee Saunders	Navy, Public Affairs Office (PAO)
11. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, ROICC Office
12. Lynne Brown	RAB Community Co-chair , Communities for a Better Environment, CFC
13. Lani Asher	RAB member, Communities for a Better Environment, CFC
14. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, ROSES, Silverview Terrace Homeowners Association
15. Maurice Campbell	RAB member, BDI, CFC, New California Media
16. Charles Dacus	RAB member, R.O.S.E.S.
17. Chris Hanif	RAB member, Young Community Developers
18. Mitsuyo Hasegawa	RAB member, JRM Associates
19. Lea Loizos	RAB member, ARC Ecology
20. Kevyn Lutton	RAB member, resident
21. J.R. Manual	RAB member, JRM Associates
22. Jesse Mason	RAB member, CFC
23. Georgia Oliva	RAB member, CBE, CCA member
24. Karen Pierce	RAB member, BVHP Democratic Club, HEAP
25. Melita Rines	RAB member, India Basin Neighborhood Association
26. Sam Ripley	RAB member, Samoan American Media Services
27. Ahimsa Sumchai	RAB member, BVHP Health and Environmental Resource Center
28. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, resident
29. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, BVHP Coalition on the Environment
30. Tom Lanphar	RAB member, Dept Toxic Substances Control
31. Jackie Lane	RAB member, US EPA
32. James Ponton	RAB member, SF Regional Water Quality Control Board
33. Michael Work	RAB member, US EPA
34. Arvind Acharya	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc
35. Doug Bielskis	ERRG
36. Erica Bolden	YCD
37. Maurice Brown	YCD
38. Patricia Brown	Shipyard artist
39. Don Capobres	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
40. Debra Carroll	The Point
41. Marian Chapman	
42. Francisco Da Costa	Environmental Justice Advocacy
43. Sharlissa Evans	YCD
44. Benjamin Feick	Waste Solutions Group
45. Marie J. Franklin	Shoreview Environmental Justice Movement, Inc.
46. Andre Freeman	YCD
47. Rene Gonzalvez	Alpha & Omega Evangelistic Ministries

48. Neil Hart	Tetra Tech EM Inc
49. Trina Hill	YCD
50. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EM Inc
51. Espanola Jackson	Muwerkma Ohlone
52. Ken Johnson	Channel 29
53. Marques Jones	YCD
54. Ronald Keichline	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc
55. Sebrina LaFelur	
56. Andy Lakalaka	Samoan Media Services
57. Morgan Malfatti	YCD
58. Quijuan Maloof	Pendergrass & Associates
59. Debra Moore	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc
60. Sherlina Nageer	Literacy for Environmental Justice
61. Dennis Robinson	Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc
62. Paul Rodriguez	YCD
63. Bernadette Scarborough	YCD
64. Matthew L. Shaps, Esq.	Paul Hastings LLP for Lennar
65. Clifton J. Smith	CJ Smith and Assonates, Eagle Environmental Construction
66. Cynthia Stokes	Resident
67. Wayata Turner	YCD
68. Julia Vetromile	Tetra Tech EM Inc
69. Elaine Warren, Esq.	San Francisco Office of City Attorney (guest speaker)
70. Peter Wilsey	SF Dept of Public Health

ATTACHMENT B**22 APRIL 2004 - RAB MEETING
ACTION ITEMS**

Item No.	Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
Carry-Over Items				
1.	Navy to respond to letter from Kevyn Lutton (introduced at the March RAB meeting) objecting to beginning Parcel D removal action activities prior to closing of comment period	Prior to May RAB	Navy	
2.	Navy to provide to Georgia Oliva a list of items/material removed during Dry Dock 4 and Parcel E Shoreline restoration	May RAB	Navy/ Keith Forman	
3.	Navy to notify David Terzian and Navy Caretaker Site Office prior to removal of AMC's cranes at Dry Dock 4	TBD	Navy/ Keith Forman	
New Items				
1.	Lynne Brown to provide Ronald Keichline (ITSI) with language for motion related to RAB subcommittees meeting with outside agencies	ASAP	Lynne Brown	
2.	L. Brown to report on discussions with subcommittee chairs regarding consistency, content, and attendance of subcommittee meetings	May RAB	Lynne Brown	
3.	M. Work to report to the RAB about which studies went into establishing the PRGs for manganese	May RAB	EPA/ Michael Work	
4.	Navy to address the issues of concern raised by Dr. Sumchai in her presentation on <u>Parcel A ROD and Related Documents</u>	May RAB	Navy	
5.	L. Brown to forward questions from the community, if any, to ITSI in advance of the May 1 st special meeting at Milton Meyers Gym	Prior to May 1 st	L. Brown	